

Case Number:	CM13-0053554		
Date Assigned:	12/30/2013	Date of Injury:	09/20/2011
Decision Date:	04/25/2014	UR Denial Date:	10/16/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/06/2013

HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to an expert reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Orthopaedic Surgery, and is licensed to practice in New York. He/she has been in active clinical practice for more than five years and is currently working at least 24 hours a week in active practice. The expert reviewer was selected based on his/her clinical experience, education, background, and expertise in the same or similar specialties that evaluate and/or treat the medical condition and disputed items/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

The patient is a 60-year-old female with chronic back pain. The pain radiates into her legs. Physical examination revealed diminished the toe extension and decreased lower extremity sensation in the L5 distribution. Lumbar spine x-rays reveal 5 mm of spondylolisthesis at L4-5 without significant change between flexion-extension. Lumbar MRI from September 2013 revealed L4-5 disc bulge with mild spinal stenosis and facet arthrosis. Current diagnoses include L4-5 grade 1 spondylolisthesis. Treatment included physical therapy, multiple steroid injections, massage, and medication. At issue is whether L4-5 ALIF fusion surgery is medically necessary.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

The Final Determination was based on decisions for the disputed items/services set forth below:

ANTERIOR LUMBAR INTERBODY FUSION WITH ILIAC CREST BONE GRAFT: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Page(s): 305-306.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Page(s): 307.

Decision rationale: This patient does not meet established criteria for lumbar fusion. Specifically the medical records do not document instability in the lumbar spine. The flexion extension lumbar spine x-ray show no abnormal motion in the lumbar spine. While the patient does have L4-5 spondylolisthesis, the medical records indicate that this spondylolisthesis is

stable and without documented instability. The patient also does not have any red flag indicated for spinal fusion such as fracture, tumor, or progressive neurologic deficit. Established criteria for lumbar fusion surgery are not met. Lumbar fusion surgery is not medically necessary.

A VASCULAR SURGEON TO EXPOSE SPINE: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

A SECOND SURGEON: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

FOUR (4) DAY INPATIENT HOSPITAL STAY: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

PURCHASE OF A COMMODE: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

FRONT WHEELED WALKER: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

A REACHER/GRABBER: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

LUMBAR BRACE: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

RENTAL OF A BONE GROWTH STIMULATOR: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

PREOPERATIVE CHEST X-RAY: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

PREOP EKG: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

PREOP LABS: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.